



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON THE TRAGIC HYPOTHESES

BY CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE

I

THE prose hypotheses to the extant Greek tragedies were first carefully studied by F. G. Schneidewin¹ in 1852. By analysis of those hypotheses that still bear the name of Aristophanes, he was able to determine the fixed characteristics of this grammarian's arguments and thereby to regain from the unnamed hypotheses a considerable amount of Aristophanic comment. His work was carried somewhat further by Trendelenburg² in 1867, and since that time the portions of hypotheses which can be assigned to Aristophanes, have been regarded as fully determined. I have no intention of calling into question the general results obtained by these two scholars, but a repeated examination of the hypotheses has convinced me that in a few minor points we may draw the lines more accurately than they have done; yet I trust that what I shall say in trying to establish my views may be considered at best only a footnote to their work.

Schneidewin and Trendelenburg claimed to prove that Aristophanes employed in his hypotheses the following seven rubrics: (1) He gave a brief outline of the plot; (2) stated whether the subject was treated by either of the other two great tragedians; (3) gave the place of action, the composition of the chorus, the speaker of the prologue, and in all probability the dramatis personae; (4) dated the play by Olympiad and archon; also named two other contesting poets and the titles of their plays, and gave the result of the contest; (5) apparently gave the number of the play in the list of the poet's works; (6) expressed a brief aesthetic judgement; (7) enumerated the most important parts

¹ *De hypothesisibus tragoediarum Graecarum Aristophani Byzantio vindicandis commentatio*. Read Dec. 4, 1852; published in *Abhand. d. k. Gesell. d. Wissenschaften, hist.-philol. Klasse*, Göttingen, VI, 1-38.

² *Grammaticorum Graecorum de arte tragica iudiciorum reliquiae*. Bonn, 1867.

of the play, introducing his statement with the formula τὸ δὲ κεφάλαιόν ἐστι, or with ἡ ὑπόθεσις κτλ.¹ The chances of transmission have lost us many of these rubrics in certain hypotheses, for with the growing interest in mythology during the Alexandrian and Roman period, grammarians paid less attention to questions of date, contesting poets, etc.; Aristophanes' hypotheses, however, maintained themselves, at least in their important rubrics, as standard introductions to the plays. That this was the case in the second century A.D. is clearly shown by the fact that Lucian prefixed to his mock Ὠκύπους a perfect imitation of an Aristophanic hypothesis so far as the case allowed.² This is therefore an important document, and Schneidewin and Trendelenburg were justified in using it in connection with the hypotheses bearing Aristophanes' name to test those that were uncertain. While their results for both rubric one and six especially are open to criticism in certain details, considerations of space lead me to confine myself in this paper to an examination of one. The Aristophanic form is unquestionably preserved in ten hypotheses.³ Trendelenburg further claims that the outline of the plot in the hypotheses to four other plays, the *Agam.*, *Oed. Col.*, *Ion*, and *Troades*, are to be attributed to the great grammarian; he rightly rejects, without, however, giving his reasons, the outline of Sophocles' *Electra*, which Schneidewin had held to be Aristophanic.⁴

An examination of this section in the ten unquestioned hypotheses

¹ Although Trendelenburg saw that Schneidewin was wrong in understanding τὸ κεφάλαιον, found only in the hypotheses to the *Prom.*, *Oed. Rex*, *Antig.*, and ἡ ὑπόθεσις, found in hypotheses to the *Septem* and *Persae*, to be perfectly equivalent terms, he left them under the same head. While our data are quite insufficient to support an argument, I am inclined to doubt whether either belongs to Aristophanes' work. Neither is necessary after the outline of the plot has once been given, and we have every reason for believing that Aristophanes made his hypotheses very brief.

² Lucian employed rubrics 1, 3, and 6; he naturally could not use 2, and to give 4, 5, and 7 would have been more than verisimilitude required.

³ To Aeschylus *Prom.*, *Eumen.*, Sophocles *Antig.*, Euripides *Alc.*, *Bacch.*, *Cycl.*, *Iph. Taur.*, *Med.*, *Orest.*, and *Rhesus*.

⁴ The passage Schneidewin considered is one of three (best exhibited in Jahn's *Electra*,³ p. 35), all of which have the form of scholia on the opening line rather than of hypotheses proper; they tell of Orestes' history previous to the opening of the play.

shows that they all have the same characteristics and agree exactly with Lucian's hypothesis to his *Ἠκύπους*: a brief outline only is given, few or no details are mentioned.¹ They are also in accord stylistically: nine of the ten, as well as Lucian's imitation, begin with the name of the chief character in the nominative case: e. g. Lucian's *Οκύρ*. *Ἠκύπους Ποδαλερίου καὶ Ἀστασίας υἱὸς ἐγένετο κτλ.*; Euripides' *Alc.* *Ἀλκηστis ἡ Πελίου θυγάτηρ κτλ.*; *Med.* *Μήδεια διὰ τὴν πρὸς Ἰάσονα ἔχθραν κτλ.*; *Orest.* *Ὀρέστης διὰ τὴν τῆς μητρὸς σφαγὴν κτλ.*; *Rhes.* *Ῥήσος παῖς μὲν ἦν Στρυμόνος κτλ.*; Sophocles' *Antig.* *Ἀντιγόνη παρὰ τὴν πρύσταξιν τῆς πόλεως κτλ.*; Aeschylus' *Eumen.* *Ὀρέστης ἐν Δελφοῖς κτλ.* The hypothesis to the *Prometheus* alone varies with the genitive *Προμηθεὺς ἐν Σκυθίᾳ δεδεμένον κτλ.*, but its correspondence with the rest in all other respects is too close to admit of doubt as to its genuine character. The case is very different, however, with the corresponding sections in the four other hypotheses claimed for Aristophanes. I begin with the *Ion*: *Κρέουσιν τὴν Ἐρεχθίῳ Ἀπόλλων φθείρας ἔγκυν ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἀθήναις ἡ δὲ τὸ γεννηθὲν ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἐξέθηκε, τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον καὶ τοῦ ἀδικήματος καὶ τῆς λοχίας μάρτυρα λαβοῦσα. τὸ μὲν οὖν βρέφος Ἑρμῆς ἀνελέμενος εἰς Δελφοὺς ἤνεγκεν· εὐροῦσα δ' ἡ προφῆτις ἀνέθρεψε. τὴν Κρέουσιν δὲ Ξεῦθος ἔγχε· συμμαχήσας γὰρ Ἀθηναίους τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὸν τῆς προειρημένης γάμον ἔλαβε δῶρον. τοῦτω μὲν οὖν ἄλλος παῖς οὐκ ἐγένετο· τὸν δ' ἐκτραφέντα ὑπὸ τῆς προφῆτιδος οἱ Δελφοὶ νεωκὸρον ἐποίησαν. ὁ δὲ ἀγνοῶν ἐδούλευσε τῷ πατρί. . . .*

The opening sentence marks the difference between this and the Aristophanic outlines: we should expect his hypothesis to begin in some such way as *Ἴων παῖς μὲν ἦν κτλ.*, which would be followed by a brief sketch of the plot. In place of this the fragmentary first section—a mere summary of the prologue—gives a circumstantial account of events *preceding* the play at a length exceeding any of the outlines in the unquestioned hypotheses; Ion's name is not mentioned; and the actual events included within the play are not touched on at all. Thus it departs both in style and manner of treatment from the

¹ The first rubric in the hypotheses to the *Iph. Taur.* and the *Cycl.* is not complete, but in the other eight the average length is but 34 words. The fragmentary hypotheses to the *Cycl.* and to the *Iph. Taur.* when complete need not have exceeded the hypothesis to the *Rhesus*, the longest of the eight.

norm of Aristophanes' arguments, and it is impossible to agree with Schneidewin and Trendelenburg in assigning it to him. It rather belongs to some later grammarian who wished to give a fuller account of the myth than the Alexandrian master allowed himself to do. The fact that the words which follow, ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ δράματος ὑπόκειται ἐν Δελφοῖς, are the Aristophanic formula does not militate against this view, for it can be shown in many other cases that such portions of Aristophanes' hypotheses were adopted without change by later writers.

With regard to the hypothesis to the *Troades* we may not be able to speak so confidently, but a comparison of its style and structure with the almost stereotyped form employed by Aristophanes certainly arouses strong suspicion that it is wrongly attributed to him. Μετὰ τὴν Ἰλίου πύργου ἔδοξεν Ἀθηναῖ τε καὶ Πρωσιδῶνι τὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν στρατεύμα διαφθεῖραι, τοῦ μὲν εἰνοσύντος τῇ πόλει διὰ τὴν κτίσιν, τῆς δὲ μισησάσης τοὺς Ἕλληνας διὰ τὴν Αἴαντος εἰς Κασάνδραν ἔβριν. οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες κληρωσάμενοι περὶ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων γυναικῶν τὰς ἐν ἀξιώμασιν ἔδωκαν Ἀγαμέμνονι μὲν Κασάνδραν, Ἀνδρομάχην δὲ Νεοπτολέμῳ, Πολυξίην δὲ Ἀχιλλεῖ. ταύτην μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἀχιλλεῖος ταφῆς ἔσφαξαν, Ἀστυνάκτα δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν τειχῶν ἔρριψαν. Ἑλένην δὲ ὡς ἀποκτενῶν Μενέλαος ἤγαγεν, Ἀγαμέμνων δὲ τὴν χρησμοφδὸν ἐνυμφαγώγησεν. Ἐκάβη δὲ τῆς μὲν Ἑλένης κατηγορήσασα, τοὺς ἀναιρεθέντας δὲ κατοδυρμένῃ καὶ κηδεύσασα πρὸς τὰς Ὀδυσσεύς ἦχθη σκηνάς, τούτῳ λατρεύειν δοθείσα. Its opening sentence reminds one inevitably of the beginning of the hypothesis to the *Hecuba*—μετὰ τὴν Ἰλίου πολιορκίαν κτλ., but this coincidence in phrase is insufficient to warrant us in claiming common authorship for the two in the face of differences in form and style; neither has the characteristics of Aristophanes' work. Furthermore, something over half of the hypothesis to the *Troades* is occupied with an account of events that antedate the play; again, the murder of Astyanax is mentioned in connection with the killing of Polyxena over Achilles' grave, as if they were coincident (ταύτην μὲν . . . ἔσφαξαν, Ἀστυνάκτα δὲ . . . ἔρριψαν), whereas Polyxena's death is reported by Poseidon (v. 39 f.) as already past, but Astyanax is not lead away to be cast from the walls until v. 786 ff. This seems to show that the writer of this hypothesis did not take the trouble to read the play itself with care, but rather compiled from the work of his predecessors. Who these were cannot now be determined; of course Aristophanes may

have been one. But it is clear that the hypothesis in its present form does not come from him. We may also note that a comparison of the *Epit. Vat.* and the *Frag. Sabb.* (p. 212 Wag.) of Ps-Apoll. *Bibliotheca* with this hypothesis shows no stylistic agreement between them such as can be seen in the case of the hypothesis to the *Helena* (cf. p. 297); they do not therefore have a close common source, and one is tempted to believe that the hypothesis is of decidedly late composition.

We will now consider the hypothesis to Sophocles' *Oedipus Coloneus*:

‘Ο ἐπὶ Κολωνῷ Οἰδίπους συνημμένος πῶς ἐστι τῷ Τυράνῳ, τῆς γὰρ πατρίδος ἐκπεσὼν ὁ Οἰδῖπους ἤδη γεραίος ὢν ἀφικνέται εἰς Ἀθήνας, ὑπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἀντιγόνης χειραγωγούμενος· ἦσαν γὰρ τῶν ἀρσένων περὶ τὸν πατέρα φιλοστοργότεραι. ἀφικνέται δὲ εἰς Ἀθήνας κατὰ πυχρόχρηστον, ὡς αὐτός φησι, χρησθὲν αὐτῷ παρὰ ταῖς σεμναῖς καλουμέναις θεαῖς μεταλλάξει τὸν βίον. τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον γέροντες ἐγχώριοι, ἐξ ὧν ὁ χορὸς συνίστηκε, πυθόμενοι συνέρχονται καὶ διαλέγονται πρὸς αὐτόν. ἔπειτα δὲ Ἰσμήνη παραγενομένη τὰ κατὰ τὴν στάσιν ἀπαγγέλλει τῶν παιδῶν καὶ τὴν γενησομένην ἀφίξειν τοῦ Κρέοντος πρὸς αὐτόν. ὅς καὶ παραγεγόμενος ἐπὶ τῷ ἀγαγίν αὐτὸν εἰς τοῦπίσω ἀπρακτος ἀπαλλάττεται. ὁ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Θησέα διελθὼν τὸν χρησμόν οὕτω τὸν βίον καταστρέφει παρὰ ταῖς θεαῖς.

Of course it is impossible to deny here too that this rather long outline of the plot *may* have an hypothesis of Aristophanes as its basis; but if it has, the original has been changed and obscured past recognition. Indeed, Trendelenburg seems to have been somewhat doubtful in the matter himself, for after printing the hypothesis in his text, he adds in a footnote (p. 101_n) *hoc argumentum hic statim exhibui, quoniam pro fundamento ei fuisse hypothesin Aristophaneam et indoles eius et testimonium satis disertum docet*. His hesitancy was certainly not without reason, for the only words in the entire hypothesis that have the indisputable characteristics of Aristophanes are τὸ δὲ δρᾶμα τῶν θαυμαστῶν, and the last three lines ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ δράματος ὑπόκειται ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἐν τῷ ἱππῷ Κολωνῷ, κτλ. Confining our attention, however, to the argument proper we see that it opens with the title of the play and a statement as to its relation to the *Oed. Rex*. This recalls the first sentence of the discussion διὰ τί Τύραννος ἐπιγέγραπται prefixed to the earlier play — ὁ Τύραννος Οἰδῖπους ἐπὶ διακρίσει θατέρου

ἐπιγράφεται, likewise of the beginning of the fragmentary comment that follows the play in L — ὁ Τύραννος Οιδίπους πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τοῦ ἐν τῷ Κολωνῷ ἐπιγράφεται. The hypothesis to the *Ajax* also has a similar passage — ὅθεν (since Ajax scourged the ram) καὶ τῇ ἐπιγραφῇ πρόσκειται Μαστιγοφόρος, ἣ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τοῦ Λοκροῦ. Δικαίερχος δὲ Αἰαντος θάνατον ἐπιγράφει. ἐν δὲ ταῖς διδασκαλίαις ψιλῶς Αἴας ἀναγράφεται. Now it may be urged that Aristophanes devoted a portion of his critical work to determining the correct titles of plays, and that the mention of the difference between the simple title found in the didascaliae and that given by Dicaearchus is due to him. But all our evidence goes to show that he gave no space in his hypotheses to reasons for titles or to discussions as to their correctness. As a matter of fact we have in such notices as these remnants of ἀπορίαι and λύσεις of which a very apposite example is fortunately preserved in connection with Sophocles' *Electra*: ἀπορία. διὰ τί οὐκ ἐπιγράφεται Σοφοκλέους Θάνατος Αἰγίσθου καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρας ἀλλ' Ἥλέκτρα, καίτοι μὴ τι παθούσης αὐτῆς; λύσις. ἀπὸ τοῦ πολυπαθειστέρου προσώπου καὶ ἐπιμονεστέρου τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἐποίησε. παρυσάγει γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ δράματι θηρνούσαν αἰεὶ καὶ στενάζουσαν κτλ. Their incorporation in these hypotheses is due to a later redactor, very likely to Didymus. However, three other points of internal evidence may be urged against the claim that this hypothesis is Aristophanic. First we find twice ἀφικνέεται εἰς Ἀθήνας where we expect εἰς Κολωνόν or at least εἰς τὴν Ἀττικὴν. This use of Ἀθῆναι is undoubtedly due to v. 24 τὰς γοῦν Ἀθήνας αἶδα, where the district and not the city is meant. But if this part of the hypothesis were by Aristophanes, we might fairly expect it to agree with the last paragraph, which is unquestionably his; yet that has ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἐν τῷ ἱππίῳ Κολωνῷ. Such lack of agreement shows the composite character of the hypothesis in its present form. Again the outline is formally divided τὸ μὲν πρῶτον . . . , ἔπειτα δὲ . . . as in none of the hypotheses that can be certainly attributed to Aristophanes; and thirdly we have the composition of the chorus given in the midst of the plot γέροντες ἐγχώριοι, ἐξ ὧν ὁ χορὸς συνέστηκε. The genuine Aristophanic formula is found below, ὁ δὲ χορὸς συνέστηκεν ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀνδρῶν, invariably as here in connection with the scene of the play. Finally we may see Aristophanes' argument fairly well preserved in two forms: in a scholium on Statius, *Theb.* 12,

510, which Trendelenburg (p. 10₁₈) quotes without fully realizing its significance; and in Ps-Apollod. *Bibliotheca* 3, 56 Wag.

Oedipus expulsus Creontis imperio

confugit ἐπὶ Κολωνόν, in quo locus erat Furiis consecratus. sed misericordia Atheniensium illa sede est exceptus (erutus cod.) hospitaliterque tractatus.

Οἰδίπους δὲ τὰς ὄψεις τυφλώσας ἐκ Θηβῶν ἤλαυνετο, ἀρὰς τοῖς παισὶ θέμενος, οἱ τῆς πόλεως αὐτὸν ἐκβαλλόμενον θεωροῦντες οὐκ ἐπήμυναν. παραγενόμενος δὲ σὺν Ἀντιγόῃ τῆς Ἀττικῆς εἰς Κολωνόν, ἔνθα τὸ τῶν Εὐμενίδων ἐστὶ τέμενος, καθίζει ἱκέτης, προσδεχθεὶς ὑπὸ Θησέως,

καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον ἀπέθανεν.

hanc tragoediam Aristophanes scripsit.

It will be seen at once that both passages begin in the Aristophanic manner and that the outline of the play is briefly given. The scholium to Statius has suffered seriously in transmission and has wholly lost the last sentence of its original. This original was apparently in a collection of hypotheses, a handbook of mythology, such as were prepared in antiquity for school use; it seems likely that in this collection the name of the writer of the arguments was attached to them, either as heading, e.g. here Ἀριστοφάνους (γραμματικοῦ), or as authority in some such form as Ἀριστοφάνης φησὶ κτλ. This the translator misunderstanding has transmitted to us in *hanc tragoediam Aristophanes scripsit*. The passage in Ps-Apollodorus came from a similar collection, and while it may have suffered from *contaminatio*, it has well preserved the features of its original.

There remains the hypothesis to the *Agamemnon* which Schneidewin and Trendelenburg analyze as follows:

1) Ἀγαμέμνων εἰς Ἴλιον ἀπὼν τῇ Κλυταιμίστρᾳ, εἰ πορθήσοι τὸ Ἴλιον, τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας σημαίνειν διὰ τοῦ πυρσοῦ. ὅθεν σκοπὸν ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ μισθῷ Κλυταιμίστρᾳ, ἵνα τηροίη τὸν πυρσόν. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἰδὼν ἀπήγγειλεν, αὐτῇ δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτῶν ὄχλον μεταπέμπεται, περὶ τοῦ πυρσοῦ ἐροῦσα· ἐξ ὧν καὶ ὁ χορὸς συνίσταται· οἷτινες ἀκούσαντες παριανίζουσιν. μετ' οὐ πολὺν δὲ καὶ Ταλθύβιος παραγίνεται καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν πλοῦν διηγείται. Ἀγαμέμνων δ' ἐπὶ ἀπήνης ἔρχεται· εἶπετο δ'

αὐτῷ ἑτέρα ἀπήνη, ἔνθα ἦν τὰ λάφυρα καὶ ἡ Κασάνδρα. αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν προεσέρχεται εἰς τὸν οἶκον σὺν τῇ Κλυταιμῆστρῃ, Κασάνδρα δὲ προμαντεύεται, πρὶν εἰς τὰ βασίλεια εἰσελθεῖν, τὸν ἑαυτῆς καὶ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐξ Ὀρέστου μητροκτονίαν, καὶ εἰσπηδᾷ ὡς θανουμένη, ῥίψασα τὰ στέμματα.

6) τοῦτο δὲ τὸ μέρος τοῦ δράματος θανμάζεται ὡς ἔκπληξιν ἔχον καὶ οἶκτον ικανόν. ἰδίως δὲ Αἰσχύλος τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἀναίρεισθαι ποιεῖ, τὸν δὲ Κασάνδρας σιωπήσας θάνατον νεκρὰν αὐτὴν ὑπέδειξεν, πεποιθὲν τε Αἰγισθον καὶ Κλυταιμῆστραν ἑκάτερον δισχυριζόμενον περὶ τῆς ἀναίρεσως ἐνὶ κεφαλαίῳ, τὴν μὲν τῇ ἀναίρεισει Ἰφιγενείας, τὸν δὲ ταῖς τοῦ πατρὸς Οὐίστου ἐξ Ἀτρείως συμφοραῖς.

4) ἰδιόαχθῃ τὸ δράμα ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Φιλοκλείους Ὀλυμπιάδι κῆ ἔτει β. πρῶτος Αἰσχύλος Ἀγαμέμνονι, Χοηφόροις, Εὐμενίσιν, Πρωτῇ σατυρικῇ. ἐχορήγει Ξενοκλῆς Ἀφιδιεύς.

That section four comes from Aristophanes no one will question; we are now concerned with the first part only. It is evident that we have here a far more circumstantial outline than in any of the undoubted hypotheses of Aristophanes, and further that the first two sentences deal with events antecedent to the action of the play. The plot here, as in the hypothesis to the *Oed. Col.*, is interrupted by a statement as to the composition of the chorus — ἐξ ὧν καὶ ὁ χορὸς συνίσταται,¹ and finally the outline is not complete, but covers only about four-fifths of the play. A suggestion that the last part of the argument has been lost is made impossible by the fact that the following words τοῦτο δὲ τὸ μέρος τοῦ δράματος θανμάζεται κτλ. are immediately connected with the preceding sentence, which refers to Cassandra's speech and dramatic action (1264 ff.) in casting to the ground her chaplet and staff, the signs of her prophetic office. With the aesthetic judgement here expressed we are not now concerned, but I wish to emphasize the fact that there is no break between the two sentences, and that the last fifth of the play is not mentioned in the outline of the plot. The first section thus lacks the well defined features of Aristophanes' work, and we may conclude has been wrongly attributed to him.

¹ This form of the verb in place of Aristophanes' συνέστηκε is interesting, as the only other variant in 17 cases is ἐστί in the hypothesis to the *Septem*, where, however, the arrangement is the normal one. Evidently the compiler in transferring this statement unconsciously substituted a form more natural to himself.

II

The conclusions at which we have thus far arrived are chiefly negative. To these I wish to add some brief observations on certain of the longer hypotheses to Euripides. The first hypothesis to the *Alcestis* is ascribed in L to Dicaearchus, and in view of the familiar passage in Sext. Empir. *adv. Math.* 3, p. 697 Bekk., (ὑπόθεσις) πολλαχῶς μὲν καὶ ἄλλως προσαγορεύεται . . . καθ' ἕνα μὲν τρόπον ἡ δραματικὴ περιπέτεια, καθὼ καὶ τραγικὴν καὶ κωμικὴν ὑπόθεσιν λέγομεν καὶ Δικαιάρχου τινὰς ὑποθέσεις τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων, there has been little hesitancy in accepting the ascription as correct; we may therefore regard this hypothesis as typical of Dicaearchus' work.¹ A comparison of it with Aristophanes' argument shows that Dicaearchus gave the outline in more detail than the Alexandrian critic, and, here, at least, mentioned an event antecedent to the play itself, the bargain with the Fates, to which Aristophanes did not refer directly. Dicaearchus is named in C as the author of the first hypothesis to the *Medea* also. The correctness of this ascription has been doubted, for the hypothesis as it now stands is a composite of three distinct parts: an outline of the plot, mythographical matter in regard to Medea and Jason, and critical comments on the source of the plot and the dramatic treatment. Furthermore, Dicaearchus, together with Aristotle, is quoted in the last part as authority for the view that Euripides stole his plot from Neophron. If, however, we compare the outline of the plot with Dicaearchus' hypothesis to the *Alcestis* we find that it has the same characteristics, and it is clear also that the same relation exists between this argument and that of Aristophanes that we find between the two to the *Alcestis*. The first here is more detailed than that of Aristophanes, and also in its opening sentence gives the antecedent situation out of which the tragedy grows. We may therefore regard the superscription in C as correct for the first part of the hypothesis, even though it be only the conjecture of a Byzantine or Renaissance scholar. The authorship and date of the second and third parts are more uncertain. The

¹ With regard to Schrader's views on this and allied points (*Quaest. Peripat.* 1884), a non liquet appears the only verdict; his arguments do not seem weighty enough to warrant the rejection of the ascription.

second is similar to that large class of scholia in which the varied treatment of the same myth by different writers is noticed. That these comments have their origin in the mythographical activity among the Alexandrians and their successors which dates from the third century B.C. there can be no doubt. The question when and by whom this material was incorporated in our scholia is an interesting one, which can be answered only approximately. So far as this particular passage is concerned, Robert (*Bild u. Lied*, p. 231) has conclusively shown that it was known to Ovid in its present form;¹ whether it had its present place following the argument of the play, as Robert seems to believe, is not so certain, but it is very probable that it had. If this be the case, the redactor to whom we may attribute with most probability the addition of such passages to the scholia is the indefatigable Didymus. To him we may safely ascribe further the statement as to Euripides' relation to Neophron. With regard to the last part of the hypothesis *μείμονται δὲ αὐτῷ κτλ.*, it will be noted that we have a combination of unfavorable and favorable criticism, and that the first repeats in substance the blame bestowed on Euripides in the scholium to *Med.* 922. Now Trendelenburg (p. 54 ff. cf. Wilamowitz, *Her.*¹ I, 158₇₉) has made it very probable that the unfavorable criticism in the scholia to Euripides is to be attributed to Didymus. He therefore refers to him² the charges against Euripides in this hypothesis and in the scholium to v. 922, and in other similar passages.³ It is clear then that this criticism and other like comments, e. g. in the hypothesis to the *Androm.* and on *Androm.* 32, in which unfavorable judgements are offset or objected to, are due to a redactor after Didymus, who has been rightly called *defensor Euripidis*. We can therefore distinguish three strata as regards

¹ The scholium on Aristoph. *Equit.* 1321 comes from a common source with this; it gives the same information, but exactly reverses the order of authors quoted.

² As he claims, in the role of interpreter of Aristophanes of Byzantium — a quite unnecessary supposition.

³ It should be noted that such comments in this hypothesis and in that to the *Andromache* are properly scholia transferred by a redactor to the introductions. So the favorable criticism here *ἐπαυεῖται δὲ ἡ εἰσβολὴ κτλ.* is found also in the scholium on v. 1. This tends to prove that Trendelenburg and others are wrong in claiming that Aristophanes gave such detailed comment in his hypotheses. Wilamowitz likewise can hardly be right when he holds (*Her.*¹ I, 146₃₀) that the criticism on *Orest.* 1691 originally belonged to an hypothesis.

date and authorship in the hypothesis to the *Medea* as it now stands: the outline by Dicaearchus, the mythographical portion added by Didymus, and the aesthetic criticism coming in part from Didymus, but given its present form by a later hand.

The argument of the *Helena* differs from those already considered in that the argument proper is prefaced by a mythographical discussion in which the treatment of the story by Herodotus (2, 113-120), and by Homer (*Od.* 4, 227-230) as quoted by Herodotus, is inexactly contrasted with that of Euripides. The argument itself begins in the sentence ὁ δὲ (sc. Εὐριπίδης) τὴν μὲν ἀληθῶς Ἑλένην φησὶ μὴδ' ὁπωσοῦν ἔλθεῖν εἰς Τροίαν, τὸ εἶδωλον δὲ αὐτῆς. By comparing this with other hypotheses we see that the argument originally began somewhat as follows Ἑλένη μὲν οὐκ ἦλθεν εἰς Τροίαν, τὸ εἶδωλον δὲ αὐτῆς. It then continued as at present κλέψας γὰρ αὐτὴν ὁ Ἑρμῆς κτλ. The argument thus separated resembles the longer hypotheses to the *Alceſtis* and the *Medea* so closely in form and style that we may more reasonably refer it also to Dicaearchus than hold with Wilamowitz (*Anal. Eurip.* p. 54) that it is of late origin. His view can be correct only for the mythographical introduction. It is possible that this argument was one of the sources used for the history of Menelaus given in the handbook of mythology from which Diodorus, Ps-Apollodorus, and others drew.¹ The *Epit. Vaticana* and the *Frag. Sabbaitica* (p. 188 f. Wag.) tell of the rape of Helen in very similar language: ἔνιοι δὲ φασιν Ἑλένην μὲν ὑπὸ Ἑρμοῦ κατὰ βούλησιν Διὸς κομισθῆναι κλαπεῖσαν εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ δοθεῖσαν Πρωτῇ τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων φυλάττειν. The divergence in κατὰ βούλησιν Διὸς may, however, show another source.

As regards the longer hypothesis to the *Rhesus*, Kirchhoff (*Philol.* VII, 561 ff.) has held that the entire discussion of the authenticity of the play is taken directly from Dicaearchus; he further conjectures with good reason that the argument proper goes back to the same author.² Thus four hypotheses can be claimed for him. For the other arguments we have no certain data: they exhibit that fulness of detail in recounting both events preceding the plays and the plots themselves which characterized hypotheses when no longer written primarily as

¹ Cf. Bethe, *Quaest. Diod. Myth.*, pp. 45-99.

² Cf., however, Schrader's objections, *l. c.* p. 8 ff.

introductions to the tragedies but rather as more or less independent mythological accounts.¹ While their authorship must remain uncertain, the argument of the *Bacchae* at least can be shown to be of late origin, for if we compare it with the hypothesis incorporated in Ps-Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* 3, 5, 2, we see that it is only an expansion of the argument there used and therefore written later than it. This intermediate argument was probably taken by the author of the *Bibliotheca* from the mythological handbook which was his main source. But the relationship between the two establishes no certain date for our hypothesis.

¹ Cf. Robert's description of such hypotheses, *Bild u. Lied*, p. 242 ff